

1. A nearly identical RFP was released on August 18, 2006, the most notable differences being timing, publication of the DSHS maximum budget, and scoring. Can you tell us why the RFP has been re-released? Can you tell us the names of the bidders who responded to the August 18th RFP? If not, may we obtain that information from another source?

*The RFP was re-issued because the Department did not receive a plan that was considered sufficient in detail to be awarded the contract. We cannot release the name of the previous bidder until the contract resulting from this RFP is executed and you submit a Public Records Request.*

2. Section I, C. Project Scope, requires the contractor to participate in a minimum of 6 meetings of the Washington public mental health system. In the same section, item D. Project Deliverables, states that the minimum 500 hours includes in-person consultation. Are these two items referring to the same service(s)? In which city(s) will the Contractor provide these services?

*The time spent developing and implementing the six meetings will be counted as part of the minimum of 500 hours. The contractor, in conjunction with MHD, will determine the locations for the six meetings. It can be assumed that the meetings will occur at easily accessible locations throughout the state with most if not all being in the area ranging from SeaTac to Olympia.*

3. Is the Contractor required to maintain an office in the State of Washington? If so, is there a preferred city or location?

*No.*

4. Section I, E. Minimum Qualifications, states the requirements for the Contractor's Project Lead. Can this professional be licensed in any state or must he/she be licensed in the State of Washington? Also, please explain the designation ARNP.

*The project lead does not need to be licensed in the State of Washington. Acronym ARNP signifies an Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner, i.e., a prescribing psychiatric nurse.*

5. Section II, D. Contract, states that the Contract term shall likely be 6 months. Given deliverable due dates of March through June, 2007, for what reason(s) might the contracts be extended for up to two (2) one-year periods?

*Unforeseen events.*

6. Regarding Section III, G. Cost Proposal, an amendment to the August 18th RFP added a statement that indirect costs shall be limited to 10%. Does this continue to be a requirement? If so, there are many ways of calculating indirect costs. What method would the State of Washington use to arrive at the indirect cost rate?

*DSHS has received questions in past RFPs from some Universities which add on a high indirect cost charge for any projects to cover general overhead of the Institution. The 10% limitation remains for this RFP.*

7. Our question concerns the appropriateness of our bidding on this RFP. As the EQRO in WA for the mental health system, we want to make sure that it would not be a conflict of interest for us to assist the State in designing the new inpatient utilization system. Can you guide us in this matter?

*The RFP does not prevent the current EQRO from bidding on this project.*

8. We understand that the vendor selected to conduct this scope of work is not eligible to conduct the follow on work after the criteria and process have been designed. Could an External Quality Review Organization (EQRO) currently conducting review for behavioral healthcare services in Washington conduct the follow on work?

*DSHS does not anticipate any restrictions that would prevent an EQRO which met other qualification requirements from bidding on the follow up RFP that might result from this project. Like any bidder, the EQRO would be prevented from bidding on the follow up work if they become the contractor for this project which will develop the RFP.*

9. Can the Department clarify the relationship between the review vendor for the follow on work and the Regional Support Networks, which currently have admission and continued stay review responsibilities?

*This question is not pertinent to responding to this RFP.*

10. This RFP is a re-issue of a previously released request. Could the Department provide additional information concerning why the RFP has been released again? Most important would be information about areas where submitted proposals were non-responsive so that proposals for the current scope of work will be acceptable.

*The RFP was re-issued because the Department did not receive a plan that was considered sufficient in detail to be awarded the contract. We cannot release the details of the earlier proposal until the contract resulting from this RFP is executed and you submit a Public Records Request.*